

Analysis of Resolutions passed by the
California State Board of Agriculture on Dec 20, & Jan. 17

1. Only one person, among ~~all~~ present, was willing to go on record against the original resolution passed December 20 in regular meeting, all members sitting within their terms as established by the Legislature. Resolution stated:
 - (a) problem is one of military necessity solely.
 - (b) race prejudice should not defeat rights guaranteed under the national constitution.
2. After the customary new appointments, the new Board decided to rescind the original resolution, and to substitute another, which declares the original resolution was "untimely" because
 - (a) problem is "military," and
 - (b) problem is "national."
3. The President of the Board, an appointee of the present governor,
 - A. on the original resolution:
 - (1) Declared himself in favor of the resolution, but
 - (2) Declined to vote, according to the custom of presiding officers when no tie vote.
 - B. on the second resolution:
 - (1) Again declared himself in favor of the principles of the original resolution, but
 - (2) Decided to vote, although no tie vote, and
 - (3) Voted to rescind the original resolution.
4. The new Board ^{to present} says the first resolution was "susceptible to mis-interpretation."

The second resolution appears to mean that the new Board

- (1) is sorry the old Board said anything, so it
- (2) rescinds the original resolution; nevertheless, perhaps out of a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, it
- (3) is impelled to say something of its own principles, on somewhat uneasily, it
- (4) agrees substantially with the old Board that, essentially, the problem is military in character, and lies within the jurisdiction of national law.